DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 240 073 SP 023 684

AUTHOR Driscoll, Amy
TITLE Applying Research to Teacher Education: The University of Utah's Collaborative Approach. First Year Preliminary Report.
SPONS AGENCY Far West Lab. for Educational Research and Development, San Francisco, Calif.; National Inst. of Education (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE Feb 84
CONTRACT 400-83-003
NOTE 63p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (36th, San Antonio, TX, February 1-4, 1984). For related documents, see SP 023 682 and SP 023 689.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Information Analyses (070)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Cooperating Teachers; *Educational Research; Elementary School Teachers; Higher Education; Preservice Teacher Education; *Program Development; Research Design; *Research Utilization; *Student Teachers; Teacher Behavior; *Teacher Education Programs; *Teacher Effectiveness
IDENTIFIERS *University of Utah

ABSTRACT

In 1983, the National Institute of Education funded the Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development to conduct a study, Applying Research to Teacher Education (ARTE) Research Utilization in Elementary Teacher Education (RUETE). The ARTE:RUETE study's purpose is to develop preservice instruction incorporating current research findings on effective instruction and schools and to assess the impact of the preservice instruction. The RUETE facet draws upon research of effective instruction to inform teacher education practice. This two-year study integrates: (1) application of research on effective instruction, through a process of collaborative inquiry using the Interactive Research and Development on Teaching model; (2) utilization of processes of adult learning in a systematic manner; and (3) development of teacher education academies. This paper reports the first year's progress, that is, strategies developed for affecting preservice teacher education with research findings on effective instruction and preliminary assessment of those strategies. The initial development of the Teacher Education Academies is also described. The remainder of the document summarizes the situational analysis of the University of Utah site. The Utah RUETE research design and findings are described in relation to the context of the teacher education program. Appendices include materials from professional meetings supportive of this research project. (JMK)

ED240073

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

Applying Research to Teacher Education: The University of Utah's Collaborative Approach First Year Preliminary Report

Amy Driscoll
Assistant Professor, Educational Studies
Graduate School of Education
University of Utah

Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Association of Colleges of Teacher Eduation, San Antonio, Texas, February 1984.

THIS PAPER REPORTS WORK CARRIED OUT WITH THE FAR WEST LABORATORY FOR EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT, SAN FRANCISCO, UNDER CONTRACT 400-83-003 FROM THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION, DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION. THE OPINIONS EXPRESSED DO NOT NECESSARILY REFLECT THE POSITION OR POLICY OF THE INSTITUTE OR THE LABORATORY AND NO OFFICIAL ENDORSEMENT SHOULD BE INFERRED.

SP023684

INTRODUCTION

In 1983 the National Institute of Education (NIE) funded the Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development (FWLERD) to conduct a study, Applying Research to Teacher Education (ARTE) Research Utilization in Elementary Teacher Education (RUETE). The purpose of the ARTE:RUETE study is to develop preservice instruction incorporating current resarch findings on effective instruction and effective schools and to assess the impact of the preservice instruction.

The Research Utilization in Elementary Teacher Education facet of the ARTE study draws upon existing findings from the research on effective instruction to inform teacher education practice. The design and implementation of this two-year study integrates: (1) the application of research on effective instruction, (2) the uilitization of processes of adult learning in a systematic manner, and (3) the development of teacher education academies.

FWLERD, in conjunction with the staffs of preservice elementary teacher education programs at three regional institutions of higher education, is applying some 10 years of research on teaching in elementary schools to build preservice teacher trainees' knowledge and skills in the areas of effective classroom instruction. The application of research is occurring through a process of collaborative inquiry, using the Interactive Research and Development on

Teaching (IR&DT) model developed at FWLERD. The IR&DT central theme of collaborative inquiry provides knowledge about and experience in solving problems in concrete and directly relevant professional situations. Study participants are involved at two major levels: the Regional Teacher Education Team (RTET) level and the Teacher Education Academies (TEA) level. Experiences at these two levels include two years of field activities. Engaging teacher education personnel in a RTET for collaborative research purposes provides a forum of multiple perspectives. It is expected that the academy network system will facilitate communication and result in long-term collaboration for effective instruction and school improvement.

The study consists of two major phases: Phase I, from December 1982 to November 1983, and Phase II, from December 1983 to November 1984. The first year is designed to establish a RTET, to incorporate recent research findings from elementary school effectiveness studies into the preservice elementary school teacher education process, and to initiate the teacher education academies. The second year's plan proposes to concentrate on more fully developing the academies, which are the cornerstone of both phases. This paper reports the progress of the first year, that is, strategies developed for impacting preservice teacher

education with the research findings on effective instruction and preliminary assessment of those strategies. The initial development of the Teacher Education Academies is also described.

In its first year, the study selected and convened a Regional Teacher Education Team (RTET), consisting of experienced teacher educators from these institutions:

- University of Utah, Salt Lake City (Amy Driscoll, Regional Research Fellow), in collaboration with the Salt Lake City School District;
- University of Nevada, Reno (Kenneth Johns, Regional Research Fellow), in collaboration with the Washoe County School District; and
- Mills College, Oakland, California (Richard Ponzio, Regional Research Fellow), in collaboration with Vallejo City Unified School District.

The team collaboratively examined the consistent patterns of research findings about effective instruction and successful elementary schools and employed those findings in analyses of classroom situations. The examination of research findings included reviewing, discussing, elaborating, and interpreting major aspects of instructional effectiveness research at the elementary school level.

Each RTET member then developed a situational analysis

of his/her teacher education site which described university setting, program, practicum, student population, cooperating school districts, certification requirements, faculty population and current knowledge and use of research findings on effective instruction. The situational analysis informed both the research design and the teacher education academy plans. The remainder of this document will summarize the situational analysis of the University of Utah site. The Utah RUETE research design and findings will be described in relation to the context of the teacher education program as reported in the situational analysis.

SITUATIONAL ANALYSIS

Contextual variations in community-at-large, school district, student population, state and local education agencies, all impact a teacher education program. Therefore, research and development efforts within a teacher education program must initiate a situational analysis. Planning without contextual considerations can result in temporary and/or ineffective programs. Improvements in teacher education have as an ultimate goal, increased learning from students. Students live in socio-cultural contexts which influence instruction, and those preparing to teach must understand those considerations in order to plan instruction. Similarly those preparing teachers in a university setting have a set

of contexts to recognize and understand.

The University of Utah has had a long and rich tradition in the preparation of teachers and other school personnel. At the time the University was founded in 1850, provisions were made for the creation of a "Normal Department" to offer a two-year program for teacher preparation. The Department of Education eventually became the State College of Education and in 1963 was renamed the Graduate School of Education, with both graduate level study and some undergraduate programs.

The Department of Educational Studies is accountable for the certification and degree programs in early childhood education and elementary education and for certification only in secondary education.

Broadly speaking, all of the basic teacher education programs are predicated on the assumption that the preparation of teachers must include a strong background in general/liberal education coupled with a rich and varied experience in educational pedagogy. A further assumption is that the preparation of a teacher is a life-long process and consequently preservice education is only the beginning of a preparation continuum which should extend throughout the career of any educator.

The teacher role is viewed as a dynamic one and the person prepared for that role must be capable of identifying,

organizing, and managing intra- and interindividual learning differences and subsequent prescriptions. It is further believed that every teacher must be aware of the differing social contexts in which she/he may assume a teaching role.

Within the broad philosophical framework each basic program has described explicit objectives that characterize the role of a teacher in that given area of specialization. The teacher should have a broad and well-developed knowledge of those areas of human endeavor and learning fundamental to humankind. This knowledge is to be supported by skills and personality traits which permit a teacher to organize that knowledge into forms communicable to children and appropriate for special and individual needs. The skills, knowledge and attitudes are also to be demonstrated by evidence of self-growth and professional development. Student teaching is designed to be the culminating professional laboratory experience for students seeking elementary and early childhood certification. It provides the opportunity for student teachers to test and reconstruct the theories which they have learned, and to further develop their own teaching syles. Since student teaching provides the opportunity for the student to translate theoretical principles of methodology into sound, effective educational practices, it is essential that the major portion of

professional preparation be completed before the student is considered for a student teaching placement.

While specific program prerequisites for student teaching vary, each requires that the student have completed courses in methods of teaching, proven competency in metrics, and maintained a minimum cumulative grade point average of 2.7 on a 4.0 scale.

The Divisions of Elementary Education and Early Childhood Education have organized an intense, collaborative system of student teaching supervision with seven local elementary schools in three immediate school districts: Granite, Jordan and Salt Lake. These schools are known as Professional Development Centers (PDC's). They are chosen with consideration of quality of school, representation of SES and cultural diversity in student population, location and commitment to working with student teachers expressed by faculty and principals. All student teaching occurs in these schools. This long-term arrangement allows for continuity of contact between university and school district personnel, and continual growth of all participants. The teachers within the schools are selected for their interest in supervising student teachers and their excellence as classroom teachers. Cooperating teachers are called associates and hold clinical faculty appointments in the Department of Educational Studies

with accompanying benefits and privileges. These associates often assist in teaching undergraduate classes, serve on department committees and participate in research studies. A large proportion of the associates are pursuing graduate degrees. The division appoints a faculty member to each school as a coordinator to work with both teachers and student teachers. The coordinator provides continuing inservice work with the teachers, especially around matters affecting student teaching and toward continuing professional development. The principal in a PDC is referred to as a director and is actively involved in seminars for both student teachers and associates, as well as in university functions which parallel those of the associates.

During the practicum, the director, the coordinator and the associate are all actively involved in observation, supervision and guidance of the student teachers. At the end of the practicum, all formally evaluate the student teacher's performance on standard rating forms. In addition, the Department of Educational Studies conducts ongoing evaluation of the PDC's in general and of each of the participants (director, coordinator and associate).

During 1981 and 1982, efforts to better collaborate in the teacher education process brought together elementary and early childhood education faculty, PDC principals, cooperating

teachers and student teachers for quarterly forums. These meetings alternated the focus from "needs not being met in education courses" to "needs not being met in the student teaching experience". Each meeting concluded with lists of recommendations for both the public school faculty (PDC) and the teacher education faculty. Current course syllabi and several courses additions reflect many of these recommendations. Plans for 1983-84 are focused on the integration of the teacher education academies with the PDC's, and promotion of the research findings on effective instruction.

Elementary and early childhood teacher education students generally have had a wide variety of travel and work experiences, approximately 16 percent of the students seeking certification in elementary and early childhood already have a bachelor's degree and are seeking a second degree or certification. Approximately 10 percent of the students are working toward dual certification. At the present time, there are 190 students enrolled in elementary education and 70 in early childhood for a total of 260 students. The age range of students is from 18 to 55 years of age. Of the total student population, 145 are over 25 years of age. Autobiographical sketches reveal a large percentage of married students with families (58 percent). The cumulative grade point average for elementary

students is 3.26 and for early childhood is 2.99.

Certification requirements specified by the Utah State Board of Education are followed by the Graduate School of Education, University of Utah. The basic professional certificate may be acquired upon completion of an approved baccalaureate program in early childhood education/elementary education from an accredited institution. Student teaching is a requirement. The prescribed elements of professional studies have integrated basic guidelines from the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Recommended Standards, Utah State Office of Education and specific materials from various professional organizations. Of the total 41 faculty in the Department of Educational Studies, 15 faculty teach courses for the Elementary and Early Childhood Divisions of the teacher preparation program. These faculty represent a range of 2 to 28 years of experience at the University of Utah, and one-third received doctoral degrees from the Utah institutions. In contrast to the "typical teacher educator" described by Carter and Griffin (1981) as much younger and having earned an undergraduate degree with a major outside of a college of education, the typical University of Utah educator is over 45 years of age and earned an undergraduate degree in education. Other demographics fit Carter and Griffin's picture; that is, most are at the Associate

Professor level, are Anglo and come from a limited work experience background, specifically teaching. Eight of the Utah teacher educators are female while seven are male.

The Regional Teacher Education Team identified five general areas of research findings that would be of interest and value to include in the preparation of elementary student teachers. The five topics were gleaned from research on effective instruction and were identified as being well adapted to elementary teacher preparation at both the theoretical and practical levels. The five topics include:

1. General student participation styles.
2. Activity structures including grouping, task demands
3. Academic learning time (ALT) including allocated time, student engagement, student success.
4. Active teaching behaviors including lesson planning, explanation and demonstration, supervised practice, review, monitoring and feedback.
5. Classroom management incuding "withitness", overlapping, smoothness, momentum, group alerting, accountability, valence, challenge arousal, variety challenge.

The Regional Teacher Education Team in collaboration with the FWLERD staff developed survey guides appropriate for obtaining a situational analysis from student teachers,

cooperating teachers, and teacher education faculty. The dimensions assessed related to levels of existing knowledge and use in applications of the research related to the five topics. The surveys were administered in an interview situation to student teachers, cooperating experienced teachers, and college faculty working with the elementary credential program. Each was asked to identify their levels of knowledge and level of application of the research findings appropriate to their role. The questioners probed to see if the interviewee had gained the knowledge/skill from primary sources identified in the research topics, or from other sources who just happened to use the topic terms in their lexicon.

At the University of Utah site, ten student teachers, ten cooperating teachers and ten teacher education faculty members were randomly selected to be interviewed. The interviews for faculty and for students from this site revealed little or no knowledge of research on effective instruction as defined by this study. Neither faculty nor students were able to identify major researchers in this field. Furthermore, the teacher education faculty reported limited use of effective instruction research in their course work.

Responses from cooperating teachers, on the other hand, reflected knowledge of the research on effective instruction; sixty percent of those interviewed reported knowledge of

research on effective instruction. These responses were supported by the identification of major researchers associated with the effectiveness literature. This knowledge may have been due in part to the significant number of cooperating teachers who had completed or were currently enrolled in graduate programs. Further investigation revealed that these teachers had participated in coursework with the RTET member from the Utah site, which then explains their reported knowledge of the research findings. One one topic, activity structures, appeared to be unknown to this group of respondents. It is interesting to note that although effective instruction research had impacted the teaching of cooperating teachers, it had little influence on the teaching required of their student teachers.

RESEARCH DESIGN

The situational analysis directed the development of a research design characterized by collaboration. The nature of the Professional Development Centers together with the significant working relationships which the Graduate School of Education enjoys with local school districts and the state agency reflect Howey and Gardner's concept of "the professions working together" toward the improvement of teacher education (1983).

It was important that the research and development

efforts at the Utah site reflect that philosophy. The lack of both knowledge and use of the research findings on effective instruction among student teachers, teacher education faculty and some cooperating teachers further supports the focus of this research design, that is the research findings on effective instruction. Studies of effective teachers have directed professional attention to clearly defined teaching behaviors which promote high levels of student participation, positive attitudes and increased achievement (Good, 1983; Fisher, et al, 1980). These findings have impacted inservice programs with promising results. Current inservice experiments have demonstrated that teachers can change their behavior and student achievement can be affected (Gage and Giaconia, 1981). However, as Stallings states, "The spotlight for educational improvement in the 1980's is on preservice education (1983)." This leads to the major research question of this project. . . Can the research findings on effective instruction impact the teacher education process?

This research question was posed and investigated through the Interactive Research and Development on Teaching (IR&DT) model developed at Far West Laboratory. As described by Tickunoff and Mergendoller (1983), the IR&DT model is a team-centered research and development strategy characterized by collaboration. The model engages teachers, researchers and

and trainer/developers in the conduct of both inquiry and problem-solving. IR&DT team members have parity in the decision-making which involves research topics, methodology and training. Additionally, the IR&DT process respects the integrity of the classroom. The IR&DT process is one of intervention bringing about changes in the ways teachers, researchers and trainer/developers conceive and manage their professional roles. It is a responsive strategy which attends to implications of the University of Utah situational analysis as well as the national agenda for research on teacher education (Howey and Gardner, 1983; Hall and Hord, 1982). This research project placed preservice teachers, experienced teachers and teacher education faculty in a collaborative IR&DT mode for the purpose of responding to the major research question. That is, can the research findings on effective instruction impact the teacher education process?

The following research design has been developed in two phases. Phase I describes the hypotheses and methodology specific to the collaborative development of Phase II. Phase I consisted of collaborative decision making to determine specific methodological components of Phase II. The nature of the collaborative process demanded that Phase I have broad parameters so that participants could collaboratively pose research questions and prescribe methodology and analysis.

In this research project, Phase II has evolved from Phase I.

The following definitions will serve as clarification of terms for both Phase I and II of the research design:

1. Preservice teachers or student teachers are elementary education students in a certification program, prior to and/or during student teaching.
2. Experienced teachers or cooperating teachers are elementary classroom teachers, with a minimum of five years of experience, who participate in the teacher education process in a supervisory role during field experiences.
3. Teacher education faculty refers to those faculty members who teach elementary education methods courses (language arts, social studies, science)--courses in various content areas of teaching, which require both course work and field experience.
4. Effective instruction refers to teaching behaviors which promote high levels of student participation, positive attitudes and increased achievement; research in this area include findings on Academic Learning Time (ALT) (Fisher, et al, 1978, 1980), Active Teaching Behaviors (ATB) (Good, 1979, 1983) and Activity Structures (ASP) (Bossert, 1977, 1978, 1979).

Phase I - Hypotheses. The following hypotheses are posed.

1. Student teachers who participate in the collaborative development of preservice training using the research findings on effective instruction will not differ significantly in their ability to demonstrate the teaching behaviors identified in the preservice training from those student teachers who do not participate.

2. Student teachers who participate in the preservice training using the research findings on effective instruction will not differ significantly in their ability to demonstrate the teaching behaviors identified in the preservice training from those student teachers who do not participate in the preservice training.

Phase I - Methodology. The major elements of this phase of the project are:

1. sample selection and assignment to groups,
2. collaborative session to develop preservice instruction.

1. The sample consisted of 12 preservice teachers in the elementary education certification program at the University of Utah, four teacher education faculty members from the same institution and four experienced cooperating teachers from the elementary schools in the Salt Lake School District. All members of the sample were volunteer and are further described in

definitions (p. 16) and in Phase II.

The twelve preservice teachers were randomly assigned to three groups: Treatment A_{ST}, those who participate in the collaborative session; Treatment B_{ST}, those who receive the preservice instruction; and Treatment C_{ST}, the control group, with neither participation in the collaborative session or preservice instruction.

2. The collaborative session consisted of three phases:
   a. review and consideration of the research findings on effective instruction;
   b. decision on the area of research findings which participants consider most critical to the teacher education process; and
   c. design of preservice instruction based on selected area of research findings.

The one week collaborative session was documented through the use of pre- and post-tests, videotapes, journals and naturalistic observations and recordings. Aspects of the collaborative session were described in evaluative summary sheets at the end of each day.

The preservice instruction was designed during the collaborative session and is described in Phase II - Methodology. It was implemented prior to the 1983 Fall Quarter of student teaching.

Further decisions affecting the research design, were dependent upon decisions made at the collaborative session.

Phase I - Instruments and Materials. The materials used in the collaborative session include readings on the research of effective instruction, specifically in the areas of Academic Learning Time, Active Teaching Behaviors and Activity Structures. An agenda for the collaborative session, a reading list and observation forms can be found in Appendix A. Assessment materials including pre- and post-test tests, response/evaluation forms, and questions for directed journal writing have been developed by the primary investigators and used for the collaborative session (see Appendix B). Instrumentation for final data collection, that is observation of student teachers was determined by decisions made in the collaborative session.

Phase II - Introduction. A brief summary description of the proceedings of the collaborative session is appropriate as a preface to Phase II. As prescribed in Phase I, the session was held in July 1983 for four days. The primary objectives of the session were: 1) to review major topics in the research on effective instruction; 2) to determine ons focus from the major topics for Phase II research; and 3) to develop pre-service instruction using the determined focus.

Session participants were 4 student teachers,

4 cooperating teachers and 4 teacher education faculty members. The four student teachers were seniors in the elementary education teacher certification program, registered to student teach during Fall Quarter 1983. All student teachers were female, with a mean age of 30.5 representative of the undergraduate teacher education population of the Graduate School of Education, University of Utah (see Situational Analysis, Driscoll & Gee, 1983). Two of the student teachers were to student teach in 4th grade and two were to student teach in the 6th grade. The four cooperating teachers in attendance were female, had an average of 10.2 years of teaching experience with a range of 6 to 19 years, and taught elementary grades second, fourth and sixth. The cooperating teachers had a minimum of two years experience working with student teachers and a maximum of six years experience. The teacher education faculty participants all taught elementary education "methods" coursework in the teacher certification program and represented the content preparation areas of reading/language arts, aesthetics, science and social studies. All faculty members were female and had an average of 5.2 years of teaching at the University level and 9.7 years of elementary classroom teaching.

The agenda for the collaborative session consisted of a review of major topics in the research on effective

instruction, selection of one topic for a research and development focus and the development of a preservice instruction plan. Specific activities and scheduling can be found in the agenda, Appendix A.

The participants followed the agenda and on the third day collaboratively selected the research findings on Active Teaching Behaviors (ATB) as most salient to preservice teacher education. Following this decision, participants then developed a preservice instruction plan consisting of review of research on Active Teaching Behaviors, extensive observation of videotapes for identification and recording of ATB, assessment of lesson plans for ATB and role playing ATB with peers. Additionally ATB observation forms were to be used in self-observation, observations of peers and of cooperating teachers and by University coordinators in supervision of student teachers.

During the collaborative session, responses were collected daily through directed journal writing and end of session evaluations. Pre- and post-tests were administered at the beginning and end of the collaborative session to determine participants' general knowledge of the research on effective instruction. Naturalistic observations of the collaborative process were recorded for use in a descriptive case study.

Phase II - Hypotheses. The hypotheses developed for Phase I will be tested as part of Phase II. In lieu of general terms such as "teaching behaviors," specific labeling "active teaching behaviors (Good, 1979, 1983)" is substituted. "Research findings on effective instruction" can now be interpreted as "research findings on active teaching behaviors (Good, 1979, 1983)".

Phase II - Methodology. Three procedural elements are the methodological focus of Phase II. These include:

1. preservice instruction,
2. observation/data collection,
3. data analysis.

The time line on the following page reflects the sequence of procedures for Phase I and Phase II.

1. The preservice instruction as developed in the collaborative session uses the research on Active Teaching Behaviors as the content focus and is designed as part of the "Early Experience" session for Fall quarter student teaching. The "Early Experience" session is a four week pre-student teaching program consisting of half-day attendance in classrooms, observations, mini-teaching lessons and seminars with teacher education faculty. The "Early Experience" session is not mandatory at this time but is offered to enrich the student teaching experience. The preservice instruction on Active

TIMELINE

Procedures	1983 MAY	JUNE	JULY	AUG.	SEPT.	OCT.	NOV.	DEC.	1984 JAN.	FEB.
1. Sample Selection and Assignment	———									
2. Collaborative Session		———								
3. Implementation of Preservice Instruction			———							
4. Observation/ Assessment						———	———			
5. Data Analysis									———	

Teaching Behaviors consisted of four sessions, two hours each, in the following format:

a. Session One (first week) - Introduction to the research on Active Teaching Behaviors; observation via videotapes.

b. Session Two (second week) - Extensive observation via videotapes; Discussion of peer observations focused on Active Teaching Behaviors; T. Good's Active Teaching videotape (A.S.C.D.), 1983).

c. Session Three (third week) - Review of lesson plans for inclusion of Active Teaching Behaviors; observations via videotapes; discussion of Missouri Mathematics Effectiveness Project.

d. Session Four (fourth week) - Role playing of lesson plans to demonstrate and critique use of Active Teaching Behaviors; summary discussion and evaluation.

2. Data collection was primarily conducted through observation of student teachers. The sample groups of student teachers consisting of Treatment A_{ST}, Treatment B_{ST} and Treatment C_{ST} were observed during mathematics instruction for three one-hour sessions. Observations recorded the incidence of Active Teaching Behaviors using the Teacher

Instructional Behavior Record (TIBR) developed by Far West Lab (1983). The TIBR contains 20 teacher behavior items (see Figure 1) in four teaching categories (Introduction, Instruction, Closure and Management). Recordings are made every 60 seconds, and include notation of incidence, additional behaviors observed, and a narrative description for each teacher behavior recorded. Observations and recordings were done by two trained observers, graduate assistants with the ARTE:RUETE project. Training of the observers was conducted according to the TIBR Manual (Gee, 1983) during October 1983. Training proceeded until observers reached 90% reliability of observations.

3. Data analysis focused on the comparisons described in Phase I. Major findings will consist of comparisons of the sample groups on each behavior item of the TIBR and on behavior categories of the TIBR. Each treatment group will be described separately by means of frequency counts and proportions. Each treatment group will then be compared with parallel treatment groups for differences in the categories of behavior and in the individual behavior items using a chi square statistic.

Results

At this writing, only preliminary analysis of the data has been performed. This report considers only the frequency

of occurrence of the Active Teaching Behaviors recorded on the observation form.

Table I displays the frequency of behaviors within each category of Active Teaching Behaviors. The categories include: Introduction, Instruction, Closure and Management. Figure 1 illustrates the individual teaching behaviors within each category.

The chi square statistic for an overall comparison of student teacher groups across categories of teaching behaviors indicates significant differences ($\chi^2 = 29.2$ (6) $p > .0001$). It appears that the category of considerable difference for treatment and control groups is Introduction. Within the Introduction category, differences in Behaviors 1, 3, and 4 are responsible for the differentiation between treatment and control groups in their use of introductory behaviors.

Trends in categories Instruction and Closure are mixed and difficult to interpret. The difference between Treatment A student teachers and the control group in use of Instruction behaviors could be explained by the lapse of time between the collaborative session (July 1983) and student teaching (Sept. - Dec. 1983). However, differences within the Closure category reflect a trend of another direction as Treatment B student teachers demonstrate Closure behaviors least often. Their treatment immediately preceded student teaching so

the time lapse issues does not maintain across categories. Within the Instruction category, there is relatively even distribution of behaviors across groups; both Behaviors 13 and 14 contribute significant differences across student teacher groups to the Closure category. The treatment groups review the lessons with greater frequency while the control group collects homework more often.

Within the Management category, there are less considerable differences between the three groups of student teachers. The control group does use more management behaviors than the treatment groups. Behavior 19 does account for a major difference in the student teacher groups' use of management strategies (see Table 2). It may be that differences in the other categories of teacher behavior may precipitate the need for more management behaviors. For all of the trends and possible relationships, further study is recommended.

The Utah regional research fellow acknowledges the need for extended analysis of the observed frequencies and consideration of the rich descriptive data available. The limitations of a small sample, singular teacher education site, restricted observations, and untested instrumentation preclude the presentation of direct findings. There is a hesitance at this writing to draw implications for teacher education until further study is conducted.

The most salient product of this investigation is the process implemented at the Utah site. Further study will view the interactions, perceptions and valuing of the participants in the treatment processes. Those investigations will inform the results and implications of the Utah findings.

TEACHER EDUCATION ACADEMY

An integral part of the ARTE:RUETE project is the development of a Teacher Education Academy begun in September 1983. The academy represents a dissemination aspect of the research previously described.

The Teacher Education Academies provide a forum for education professionals at many levels to collaborate to apply research findings on effective instruction to the training of teachers as well as to school improvement efforts. At the same time, the academies serve as inquiry-based centers in which the problems and concerns of members can be identified and collaboratively resolved by the exchange of information among members.

The situational analysis and the research design for the University of Utah site directed initial identification of academy members. Planning participants included the July 1983 collaborative group, members of the Professional Development Centers, administrative personnel from local school districts, representatives from the State Office of

Education and faculty from the Graduate School of Education.

The initial planning for the Utah Teacher Education Academy occurred in several sessions. Planning/organizational meetings were convened during August-September 1983. The collaborative process which evidences in both the teacher education program and the research design of the University of Utah site characterized the planning processes for the academy. Members described previously determined the focus of the academy, format of academy gatherings, scheduling and additional membership.

The final planning nd development phase of the University of Utah Teacher Education Academy occurred at the PDC retreat on September 21, 1983, at Sill Home Living Center on the Utah campus from 8:30 to 5:00 p.m. Invitation letters (see Appendix C) were sent on September 1, 1983 to eight elementary school principals, superintendents, and curriculum supervisors from three major school districts, representatives from the Utah Office of Education, a classroom teacher representative for each of seven PDC's, the dean and associate dean of the Graduate School of Education, and all faculty involved in elementary teacher education. The Educational Studies Department provided facilities for the retreat, morning refreshments, and lunch.

As described in the agenda (Appendix C), the morning session was scheduled with introductions, an overview of the day's work, and consideration and planning of a curriculum focus. Following lunch, the group began work on the instructional focus with a presentation on the current body of research on effective instruction. Following the overview presentations, participants chose a small group study session to attend for 30 minutes. Choices of study topics included: research on classroom management (Kounin, 1970; Brophy, 1982), research on academic learning time (Fisher, Berliner, Filby, Marliave, Cahen, & Dishaw, 1980), research on active teaching behaviors (Good & Grouws, 1975; Good, 1979) and research on activity structures/grouping (Bossert, 1977, 1978, 1979). Following the study sessions, participants chose a small group work session to develop a plan of action for each research topic. Plans to relate the areas of research to undergraduate, graduate, and inservice programs were considered. After brief work sessions, only the groups on classroom management and active teaching behaviors presented plans and arguments for the importance of their choice. The entire group considered both topics and voted to pursue active teaching behaviors as an instructional focus for 1983-84. Participants also agreed that initially the objective would be intensive study for understanding. The group then brain-

stormed strategies for studying active teaching behaviors. These suggestions included: small study groups, reading packages, small scale action research projects, half-day seminars, speakers, panels, discussion groups, videotapes demonstrations, and use of observational forms. Discussion was concluded with the recommendation that a "study package" on active teaching behaviors be developed for presentation to school principals, teacher education faculty, and school district administrators. Representatives from Granite District, the largest school district in the state, asked that the study package be available to all teachers in the district, not limited to PDC associates. The group agreed to extend the study package to classroom teachers in Salt Lake, Granite, and Jordan districts. A curriculum director from Murray District, a small outlying district, expressed a similar request. Although there are no PDC's in Murray, the group agreed to coordinate with Murray District to study active teaching behaviors.

In general, post-session responses to the PDC retreat were positive, stating that the day's work met expectations. Approximately 25% of the group expressed a regret that the research on effective instruction was presented in a brief format. Most responses indicated intent to study the research further and pledged support for future plans. Recommendations included continued dialogue between schools

and universities, further study of classroom research, and involvement of student teachers.

Following the recommendations of the retreat participants, the Utah Regional Research Fellow developed the study package on active teaching behaviors (Appendix D). A major consideration was meeting individual needs with a variety of study strategies, from reading articles to participating in discussions, so that many people could be involved at varying levels. Also critical to the study package were general recommendations from research on staff development for effective teaching (Sparks, 1983; Mohlman, Coladarci and Gage, 1982; Showers, 1983). These include:

1. Select content that has been verified by research to improve student achievement.

2. Create a context of acceptance by involving teachers in decision making and providing both logistical and psychological administrative support.

3. Conduct training sessions (more than one) two or three weeks apart.

4. Include presentation, demonstration, practice, and feedback as workshop activities.

5. During training sessions, provide opportunities for small-group discussions of the application of new practices and sharing of ideas and concerns about effective instruction.

6. Between workshops, encourage teachers to visit each others' classrooms, preferable with a simple, objective, student-centered observation instrument. Provide opportunities for discussions of the observation.

7. Develop in teachers a philosophical acceptance of the new practices by presenting research and a rationale for the effectiveness of the techniques. Allow teachers to express doubts about or objections to the recommended methods in the small group.

Before presentation in final form, several groups gave input to revision. These included the July 1983 collaborative group, the August 1983 elementary teacher education faculty, and the PDC principal planning committee. Copies of the study package have been distributed to the seven Professional Development Centers, four school districts (Granite, Jordan, Murray, and Salt Lake), and the Utah Office of Education.

On November 7, 1983, the study package description was disseminated to the participants previously described. As of this writing three elementary school faculty groups have studied the research on Active Teaching Behaviors and are currently conducting action research projects in their individual classrooms. Teacher education faculty in the Department of Educational Studies have scheduled faculty meetings for the pursuit of studying active teaching behaviors. Additionally, several small outlying districts have requested information on the study packages. All principals in the Granite District will be studying the research in a

condensed form and developing school-wide action research projects.

Summary

The Applying Research in Teacher Education: Research Utilization in Elementary Teacher Education (ARTE/RUETE) project as developed at the University of Utah with Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development represents an important response to Howey and Gardner's (1983) description of the gaps and problems in current preservice teacher education practices. They report few formal relationships between teacher education programs and research and development organizations; minimal collaboration between those responsible for preparing teachers and teachers themselves; lack of stringent criteria for selection and development of cooperating teachers; and a paucity of studies of how teachers can best be educated (Joyce, Yarger and Howey, 1977). The situational analysis which preceded both the development of the research design and the initiation of the teacher education academy addresses the concern for studying the process of teacher education within its varied contents. Utah is a unique teacher education arena with its cultural influences, a value system which prizes children and education, expanding schools and abundant teacher positions. The teacher education program at the University of Utah is significantly progressive and innovative with its Professional

Development Centers.

As noted in the situational analysis, the University of Utah teacher education faculty differ demographically from the "typical teacher educator" described by Carter and Griffin (1981). This project's attempt to impact the teacher education program complements the input which the public schools have into the program, coursework and field experiences. It also projects a major variation from the "typical teacher educator's decision making regarding courses and programs based on personal experience. . . with a lack of well conceived plans" (Carter & Griffin, p. 109).

The Utah education context and the ARTE/RUETE objectives have been blended into a dynamic research design with promising results and accompanying Teacher Education Academy, representing a link between an external research and development agency and a teacher preparation program. This collaborative effort, with parity for varied professional constituencies, is resulting in a conscientious study with significant implications for the process of teacher education.

References

Bossert, S. Activity structures and student outcomes. Paper presented at the National Institute of Education Conference on School Organization and Effects, San Diego, California, 1978.

Bossert, S. Tasks, group management, and teacher control behavior: A study of classroom organization and teacher style. The School Review, 1977, 85, (4), 552-565.

Bossert, S. Task and social relationships in classrooms: A study of classroom organization and its consequences. American Sociological Association, Arnold and Caroline Rose Monograph Series. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1979.

Brophy, J. Classroom organization and management. Paper presented at the Conference on Research on Teaching (Airlie House), Warrenton, Virginia, 1982.

Carter, H. L. & Griffin, G. Teacher educators - A descriptive study: Final report of NIE grant, Research in Teacher Education. Austin, Texas: Research and Development Center, 1981.

Driscoll, A. & Gee, E. W. Situational analysis: University of Utah, Salt Lake City School District teacher education program, Report of Phase I, Applying Research in Teacher Education Study. San Francisco: Far West Laboratory, 1983.

Fisher, C., Berliner, D., Filby, N., Marliave, R., Cahen, L., & Dishaw, M. Teaching behaviors, academic learning time and student achievement: An overview. In C. Denham & A. Liegerman (eds.), Time to learn. Washington, D. C.: National Institute of Education, 1980.

Fisher, C., Filby, N., Marliave, R., Cahen, L., Dishaw, M., Moore, J., & Berliner, D. Teaching behaviors, academic learning time and student achievement: Final report of Phase III-B, Beginning Teacher Evaluation Study. San Francisco, California: Far West Laboratory for Educational Research, 1978.

Gage, N. & Ciaconia, R. Teaching practices and student achievement: Causal connections. New York University Quarterly, 1981, 13, (3), 2-9.

Gee, E. W. Teacher instructional behavior record manual. San Francisco, California: Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development, 1983.

Good, T. Research on classroom teaching. In L. Shulman & G. Sykes (eds.), Handbook for teaching and policy implication. New York: Longman, Inc. 1983.

Good, R. Classroom research. Paper presented to the American Educational Research Association, 1983a.

Good, T. Teacher effectiveness in the elementary school: What we know about it now. Journal of Teacher Education, 1979, 30, 52-64.

Hall, G. E. & Hord, S. M. A national agenda for research in teacher education for the 1980s. Journal of Teacher Education, 32, (2), 1981, 4-8.

Howey, K. R. & Gardner, W. The education of teachers: A look ahead. New York: Longman Press, 1983.

Joyce, B. R., Yarger, S. J. & Howey, K. R. Preservice teacher education. Palo Alto: Booksend Laboratory, 1977.

Kounin, J. Discipline and group management in classrooms. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1970.

Mohlman, G., Coladarci, R., & Gage, N. Comprehension and attitude as predictors of implementation of teacher training. Journal of Teacher Education, 1982, 33, 31-36.

Showers, B. Transfer of training. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Montreal, 1983.

Sparks, G. Synthesis of research on staff development for effective teaching. Educational Leaderhip, 1983, 41 (3), 65-72.

Stallings, J. Implications from the research on teaching for teacher preparation. Invited paper presented at a workshop on Implications from Research on Teaching for Preservice Teacher Education, Detroit, 1983.

Tikunoff, W. J. & Mergendoller, J. R. Inquiry as a means to professional growth: The teacher as researcher. In G. S. Griffin (ed.), Staff development: Eighty-second yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education (Part II). Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1983.

FIGURE 1

ACTIVE TEACHING BEHAVIORS

Behavior 1	Stated Goals/Objectives	
Behavior 2	Outlines Lesson	
Behavior 3	Explained Concepts/Definitions	**INTRODUCTION**
Behavior 4	Reviewed Goals/Previous Instruction	
Behavior 5	Gave Directions	
Behavior 6	Didactic/Lectured	
Behavior 7	Illustrated, Modeled, Demonstrated	
Behavior 8	Questioned: Open/Concepts/Understanding	**INSTRUCTION**
Behavior 9	Questioned: Closed/Facts	
Behavior 10	Answered: Content/Questions	
Behavior 11	Answered: Procedural Questions	
Behavior 12	Provided Feedback	
Behavior 13	Summarized Lesson/Work	
Behavior 14	Collected Work	**CLOSURE**
Behavior 15	Restated Class Rules	
Behavior 16	Told to Attend	
Behavior 17	Roamed Room	**MANAGEMENT**
Behavior 18	Signalled (Non-verbal)	
Behavior 19	Scanned Room	
Behavior 20	Disciplined/Reinforced	

TABLE 1

U N I V E R S I T Y O F U T A H

COMPARISONS OF FREQUENCIES WITHIN CATEGORIES OF ACTIVE TEACHING BEHAVIORS

	CATEGORIES	INTRODUCTION	INSTRUCTION	CLOSURE	MANAGEMENT
TREATMENT A	Frequency	49	247	27	63
	% of Behavior within categories	46.2	29.7	38.6	27.0
TREATMENT B	Frequency	42	271	10	76
	% of Behavior within categoreis	39.6	32.6	22.7	32.6
CONTROL	Frequency	15	314	17	94
	% of Behavior within categories	14.2	37.7	38.6	40.3

TABLE 2

U N I V E R S I T Y O F U T A H

COMPARISONS OF FREQUENCIES OF INDIVIDUAL TEACHING BEHAVIORS

GROUPS OF STUDENT TEACHERS

	BEHAVIOR	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
TREATMENT A	Frequency	3	5	7	34	61	2	37	56	40	26
	% of behavior within categories	33.3	27.8	35.0	57.6	26.8	20.0	48.1	40.3	21.1	37.7
TREATMENT B	Frequency	6	6	10	20	68	3	24	59	70	9
	% of behavior within categories	66.7	33.3	50.0	33.9	29.8	30.0	31.2	42.4	36.8	13.0
CONTROL	Frequency	0	7	3	5	99	5	16	24	80	34
	% of behavior within categories	0	38.9	15.0	8.5	43.4	50.0	20.8	17.3	42.1	49.3

TABLE 2 (Continued)

GROUPS OF STUDENT TEACHERS

	BEHAVIOR	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
TREATMENT A	Frequency	9	26	6	11	5	24	22	1	2	9
	% of behavior within categories	17.0	24.2	66.7	31.4	33.3	34.3	31.9	100.	5.4	22.0
TREATMENT B	Frequency	19	19	3	7	3	13	32	0	6	22
	% of behavior within categories	35.8	28.8	33.3	20.0	20.0	18.6	46.4	0	16.2	53.7
CONTROL	Frequency	25	31	0	17	7	33	15	0	29	10
	% of behavior within categories	47.2	47.0	0	48.6	46.7	47.1	21.7	0	78.4	24.4

Appendix A

Collaborative Session Materials

COLLABORATIVE RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT SESSION - AGENDA
University of Utah - Regional Teacher Education Site - July 1983

Tuesday, July 5, 1983

8:45 a.m.	Journal writing
9:00 a.m.	Introductions and welcome
9:30 a.m.	Description of the Far West Lab and the ARTE:RUETE (Active Research on Teacher Education: Research Utilization in Elementary Teacher Education) - Elsie Gee, Project Director
10:30 a.m.	Description of the University of Utah site and research design - Amy Driscoll, Regional Research Fellow
11:00 a.m.	Break
11:15 a.m.	Presentation on EFFECTIVE INSTRUCTION - discussion.
11:45 a.m.	Presentation of the ACADEMIC LEARNING TIME concept, description of its elements, research findings.
12:30 p.m.	Lunch
1:15 p.m.	Discussion of the implications of ACADEMIC LEARNING TIME and the associated teaching behaviors.
1:50 p.m.	Observations of ALT in pupils via videotapes: in group with discusssion, then in individual observations - Diane Shirey, Research assistant.
3:00 p.m.	Evaluation of session.
3:15 p.m.	Journal writing.

Wednesday, July 6, 1983

8:45 a.m.	Journal writing
9:00 a.m.	Task analysis of teaching behaviors associated with ALT; development of observation form.
9:45 a.m.	Observation of teaching behaviors associated with ALT via videotapes.
10:30 a.m.	Break
10:45 a.m.	Introduction of the ACTIVE TEACHING BEHAVIORS description, research findings, etc.
12:00 p.m.	Review instrumentation for observing ACTIVE TEACHING BEHAVIORS.
12:30 p.m.	Lunch
1:15 p.m.	Continued observation of ATB via videotapes.
2:00 p.m.	Summary discussion of ACTIVE TEACHING BEHAVIORS.
2:30 p.m.	Presentation of collaborative research and development.
3:00 p.m.	Evaluation of session.
3:15 p.m.	Journal writing

Thursday, July 7, 1983

8:45 a.m.	Journal writing
9:00 a.m.	Introduction of Activity Structures, description and research findings.
10:30 a.m.	Break
10:45 a.m.	Instrumentation on Activity Structures, observation via daily lesson plans.
12:00 p.m.	Summary discussion of Activity Structures.
12:30 p.m.	Lunch

Thursday, July 7, 1983 con't.

1:15 p.m.	Journal writing
1:30 p.m.	Review and clarification session - research on effective instruction - project tasks
1:50 p.m.	Group work on persuasive presentation of topics.
2:20 p.m.	Group presentations of topics.
2:40 p.m.	Total group decision making session - selection of topic most critical to preservice education.
3:10 p.m.	Evaluation of session
3:20 p.m.	Journal writing

Friday, July 8, 1983

8:45 a.m.	Journal writing
9:00 a.m.	Discussion of adult learning processes; developmental levels of teachers.
9:45 a.m.	Review of considerations for preservice teachers' development.
10:00 a.m.	Collaborative development of preservice training (break - optional)
12:30 p.m.	Lunch
1:15 p.m.	Continued collaboration on development of preservice training.
2:15 p.m.	Evaluation considerations for preservice training.
2:45 p.m.	Description of the Teacher Education Academies; planning for development and implementation.
3:15 p.m.	Evaluation of session
3:30 p.m.	Journal writing

READING LIST

Barr, R. How children are taught to read: Grouping and pacing. The School Review, 1975, 83, 479-498.

Bossert, S. Tasks, group management, and teacher control behavior: A study of classroom organization and teacher style. The School Review, 1977, 85 (4), 552-565.

Calfee, R. & Brown, R. Grouping students for instruction. In D. Duke (ed.), Classroom management. Seventy-eighth yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part II. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1979, 144-181.

Doyle, W. Classroom tasks and students' abilities. In P. Peterson & H. Walberg (eds.), Research on teaching: Concepts, findings and implications. Berkeley, California: McCutchan Publishing Corporation, 1979.

Fisher, C., Berliner, D., Filby, N., Marliave, R., Cahen, L., & Dishaw, M. Teaching behaviors, academic learning time, and student achievement: An overview. In C. Denham & A. Liegerman (eds.), Time to learn. Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Education.

Good, T. L. & Grouws, D. A. Teaching effects: A process-product study in fourth-grade mathematics classrooms. Journal of Teacher Education, 1977, 28 (3), 49-54.

Good, T. L. & Grouws, D. A. The Missouri mathematics effectiveness project: An experimental study in fourth-grade classrooms. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1979, 71 (3), 355-362.

Research on direct instruction or interactive teaching. In American Federation of Teachers, AFL-CIO Training & Resource Manual. Washington, D.C.: Educational Issues Department, American Federation of Teachers, AFL-CIO, March 1983.

Research on time on task. In American Federation of Teachers, AFL-CIO Training & Resource Manual. Washington, D.C.: Educational Issues Department, American Federation of Teachers, AFL-CIO, March 1983.

Rosenshine, B. Content, time, and direct instruction. In P. Peterson & H. Walberg (eds.), Research on teaching: Concepts, findings, and implications. Berkeley, California: McCutchan Publishing Corporation, 1979.

Stallings, J. Allocated academic learning time revisited, or beyond time on task. Educational Researcher, December, 1980, 11-16.

Appendix B

Collaborative Session Assessment Materials

JOURNAL QUESTIONS:

Tuesday a.m. - As you begin this collaborative session, what are your expectations of the day? of the week?

Tuesday p.m. - Reflect on effective instruction and relate it to your teaching or your future teaching.

Wednesday a.m. - After reading and contemplating the ALT concept, what are your thoughts this morning?

Wednesday p.m. - Are any of the Active Teaching Behaviors of significant interest to you? Why?

Thursday a.m. - We are beginning the collaborative aspect of the session today - What are your impressions of collaboration? How do you feel about being a member of a collaborative team?

Thursday p.m. - Given the responsibility of choosing the most critical aspect of the research on effective instruction (covered in this session) for preservice teacher education, which area would you choose? Why?

Thursday p.m. - What is your choice now of the most critical aspect of effective instruction research for preservice teacher education? Why?

Friday a.m. - How do you feel about the task for the day, that is, designing preservice training?

Friday p.m. - Share your general perceptions on the tasks accomplished, collaboration, research on effective instruction, the Teacher Education Academies and your own teaching. How will this session impact your teaching?

Pre-Post Test

Knowledge of Research Findings on Effective Instruction

1. Define ALT (Academic Learning Time). _____

_____

_____

2. List the name(s) of the major researcher(s) associated with work on ALT.

_____

3. Studies on ALT have been conducted in every elementary grade level and in most subject matter content areas. T or F or ?

4. Increases in ALT have produced considerable gains in student learning as measured by achievement tests, classroom tests and other evaluations. T or F or ?

5. Increases in ALT have been associated with negative attitudes towards school and learning on the part of students. T or F or ?

6. List some teacher behaviors associated with high levels of ALT:

_____

_____

_____

7. Define Active Teaching Behaviors. _____

_____

8. List the name(s) of the major researcher(s) associated with work on Active Teaching Behaviors. _____

_____

9. Active Teaching Behaviors are those which are easily observed in classrooms. T or F or ?

10. Active Teaching Behaviors have been developed and described from a direct instruction model of teaching. T or F or ?

11. Active Teaching Behaviors take into consideration student response, classroom context, and schedules. T or F or ?

12. List some Active Teaching Behaviors. _____

_____

_____

13. Define Activity Structures. _____

_____

_____

14. List the name(s) of the major researcher(s) associated with work on Activity Structures. _____

_____

15. The work on Activity Structures has identified patterns of teacher authority associated with various types of task structure. T or F or ?

16. Organizational differences (activity structures) have been shown to be related to student behavior, pacing of instruction and self-perception of students. T or F or ?

17. Recitation has been found to be the most common instructional structure in most elementary classrooms. T or F or ?

18. List some types of Activity Structures. _____

_____

_____

EVALUATION

(Thursday, July 7, 1983)

1. Do you think today's presentation provided you with a clear understanding of activity structures? If not, what additional information would have been helpful?

2. Was the material presented at an appropriate pace? If not, what could have been done to improve the presentation?

3. What did you like most about today's session?

4. What did you like least about today's session?

THANK YOU

EVALUATION

(Friday, July 8, 1983)

1. Did you have a clear understanding of collaborative research and what you were expected to do? If not, what additional information would have been helpful?

2. Were the reading materials helpful? Are there any readings which you feel should have been excluded? If so, which ones?

3. Are there any areas for which additional reading material would have been beneficial? If so, which ones?

4. What did you like most about this week's sessions?

5. What did you like least about this week's sessions?

6. What suggestions would you make for future sessions?

THANK YOU

Appendix C

PDC Retreat

ELEMENTARY - PDC RETREAT
Sill Home Living Center - University of Utah
Wednesday, September 21, 1983
8:30 a.m. - 5:00 p.m.

8:30 Coffee, juice, rolls

9:00 Welcome
Mary Buchanan, Associate Dean for Teacher Education
Graduate School of Education

9:15 Overview of Retreat - Ladd Holt
The retreat will focus on developing goals and specific plans for integrating the undergraduate and graduate programs of the Elementary Division with the work in the Professional Development Centers. We will concentrate on two areas:
1) relating our undergraduate courses to student teaching, inservice and research work with associates; and,
2) the selection of more general instructional skills for year-long study.

9:40 Marilou Sorensen
Proposal: Children's Literature as an area for study during Autumn Quarter.

10:00 Small Group Work Session
Development of strategies/parameters for preservice, research, inservice focii in the content areas for PDC's.

10:45 Total Group
Presentation of ideas from each group. Design a plan for the 1983-84 year.

12:00 Lunch (ON US!)

1:30 Amy Driscoll
Presentation: Research on Effective Instruction

2:15 Small Group Study Session
Each group will study one area of effective instruction and explore ways it can be applied to content areas.

2:45 Small Group Work Session
Group formation based upon interest in an area of effective instruction. Group development of a plan for the academic year. The plan shcuild consider how the area is related to the undergraduate and graduate programs, inservice work and possible problems for collaborative research.

3:00 Small Group Presentations
Provide rationale for the selection of your area as the most fruitful to be studied.

3:30 Total Group

Decision making about area to be studied, procedures to be followed and division of responsibilities.

4:00 Total Group

Design an implementation plan for the study of the selected teacher behavior.

5:00 Wrap-up

Margo Sorgman, Chair of Elementary Education

THE UNIVERSITY OF UTAH

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL STUDIES
SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH 84112

September 1, 1983

Dr. John Reed Call, Superintendent
Granite School District
340 East 3545 South
Salt Lake City, Utah 84115

Dear Dr. Call,

The Division of Elementary Education at the University of Utah is now entering into its sixth year of a cooperative relationship with seven elementary schools known as Professional Development Centers. The seven Professional Development Centers are located in Granite, Jordan and Salt Lake Districts.

This cooperative venture has allowed the members of the Division of Elementary Education to work more closely with our colleagues in the public sector and become aware of their concerns and needs. The associates and directors in the PDC's have gained knowledge about our Early Childhood and Elementary Certification Programs and have influenced the course content and course offerings in both programs.

It is our desire to continue and enhance the relationship between the Division of Elementary Education and the Professional Development Centers.

On Wednesday, September 21, the Division of Elementary Education will sponser an Elementary - PDC retreat. An agenda is appendant for details. We would like to have you, and/or anyone else you deem appropriate, in attendance. If possible, we would also like to have one teacher from each PDC in your district released to attend the retreat.

To aid us in planning we need to know the names of people from your district, who plan to attend. We will send a parking permit to them prior to the retreat. Please RSVP no later than September 14. You can reach me at 581-8584, or leave a message with Debbie, our Receptionist.

If you have questions or comments, feel free to get in touch with me!

Sincerely,

Ione M. Garcia, Chair
Retreat Committee

THE UNIVERSITY OF UTAH

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL STUDIES
SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH 84112

September 1, 1983

James Cushing, Director
Orchard Elementary
6477 West 3800 South
West Valley City, Utah 84120

Dear James,

The Retreat Committee for the Elementary - PDC Retreat has been busy attending to its task and has formalized plans for the retreat on September 21st. We've arrived at an agenda that should provide an exciting fruitful day. An agenda is appendant for details.

We have extended invitations to superintendents or representatives in each of the three districts as well as Utah State Office of Education staff.

We hope you will be able to join us. Please RSVP no later than September 14. You can reach me at 581-8584, or leave a message with Debbie, our Receptionist.

If you have questions or comments, feel free to get in touch with me!

Sincerely,

Ione

Ione M. Garcia, Chair
Retreat Committee

Appendix D

Study Package on Active Teaching Behaviors

STUDY PACKAGE ON ACTIVE TEACHING BEHAVIORS

I. Introductory Seminar (half-day) on Active Teaching Behaviors with Introduction, Tom Good's videotape presentation, small group discussions, observations of videotaped teaching.

Scheduled for individual PDC's at faculty convenience.

II. Five-week Study Groups* on Active Teaching Behaviors with weekly sessions (60 mins.) to include videotapes, readings and discussion; PDC associates, coordinators and directors leading groups.

**Session I Nov. 13 - Dec. 11
**Session II Jan. 22 - Feb. 19

*Groups must be minimum of 5 participants

**Scheduled at convenience of group.

III. Reading packages with response forms to include major current research articles on Active Teaching Behaviors.

(Available Nov. 15 - Mar. 15)
125 Milton Bennion Hall

IV. Classroom/School Inquiry Projects -
Consultation and direction available for the development of action research studies of Active Teaching Behaviors.

(Available 1:00 p.m.-4:00 p.m. Nov. 17, Dec. 1, Dec. 8, Dec. 15, Jan. 12, Jan. 19, Jan. 26 - by appointment)

V. Wrap-up Seminar -
Panel presentations by Far West Research Fellows; small group sharing of action research studies; development of plans for further inquiry/dissemination.

Feb. 23, 1984
105 Milton Bennion Hall

SPONSORED BY THE PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT CENTERS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF UTAH IN COORDINATION WITH THE TEACHER EDUCATION ACADEMIES OF THE APPLYING RESEARCH TO TEACHER EDUCATION (ARTE) PROJECT FUNDED BY NIE UNDER CONTRACT 400-83-003 WITH THE FAR WEST LABORATORY.

THREE (3) CREDIT HOURS OF GRADUATE WORK IS AVAILABLE FOR ATTENDANCE/PARTICIPATION IN ALL SESSIONS (REDUCED TUITION FOR PDC ASSOCIATES).